

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are canceled. Claims 12-23 are pending. Claims 12, 13, 17, 19, 22, and 23 are amended with this paper.

Claim Objections

Claims 13, 17, and 19 are objected to. Applicant has amended those claims in accordance with the Examiner's instructions.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claims 13, 18, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 13, 18, 20, 22, and 23 have been amended to make corrections as required by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 12-16 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Dinkel et al. (US 6,398,315 B1).

In response to the rejection, Applicant has amended independent Claim 12. Claim 12 now describes, in pertinent part, an axially movable piston in a housing bore, with a seal contacting the piston and the housing bore.

Applicant respectfully submits that Dinkel does not disclose such a seal and therefore does not anticipate Claim 12. When Dinkel is juxtaposed with amended Claim 12 it can be seen that Dinkel does not include a seal that contacts both the piston and the housing bore. Instead, Dinkel, FIG. 7, discloses an O-ring 27 that contacts piston 26 and an inner diameter of housing 25. A second O-ring (not numbered, but identified by the Examiner as "seal") contacts the housing bore (not numbered) and an

outer diameter of housing 25. Since Dinkel does not include a seal that contacts both the piston and the housing bore Applicant believes that amended Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 13-16 and 19-23 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinkel et al. (US 6,398,315 B1) in view of Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Claims 17-18 depend indirectly from amended Claim 12. As stated above in the response to the 35 USC 102 rejection of Claim 12, Dinkel does not disclose the seal arrangement that is disclosed in amended Claim 12. Applicant also respectfully submits that Sinnl does not make up for the shortcomings of Dinkel as a reference. The combination of Dinkel and Sinnl does not provide all of the elements of dependent Claims 17-18 and therefore does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness. For these reasons Applicant believes that Claims 17-18 are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and prior-art rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Registration No. 39,098
Continental Teves, Inc.
One Continental Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6405
Attorney for Applicants